

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/699,145	KAEWELL ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Christopher E. Lee	2112	

**All Participants:**

(1) Christopher E. Lee (USPTO).

(2) Richard L. Cruz (Reg. No. 52,783).

**Status of Application:** RCE filed on 11<sup>th</sup> of April 2005

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

**Date of Interview:** 25 April 2005

**Time:** 3:00pm est

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

*none*

Claims discussed:

*none*

Prior art documents discussed:

*none*

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

  
(Examiner/SPE Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Applicants' representative agreed to amend Claim 7 to correct the claimed invention, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention, and, further the Applicants' representative suggested the claim language adjustment in light of the specification, which was agreed by the Examiner, detailed in the accompanying Examiner's amendment.